that a suppository specifically designed to be inserted into the urethra of a female as claimed in claim 1 could also be used to administer a medicinal agent by insertion into another passage or cavity of a female body. The Examiner provides no evidence of any alternate practical uses of a urethral suppository.

Claim 1 is directed to a urethral suppository and is not a generic suppository designed for insertion into any other passage or cavity. Applicants assert that it is improper to broaden the use of a product beyond that for which is was specifically designed when considering whether inventions are distinct for restriction purposes. Accordingly, Applicants assert that the claims of Group I and Group II should be grouped together.

In conclusion, applicant elects Group I for immediate prosecution. However, the requirement of restriction is traversed to the extent that less than claims 1-64 are maintained for examination. Applicants request reconsideration and modification of the restriction requirement.

Respectfully submitted,
S. GRANT MULHOLLAND, et al.

By: _____

DANIEL A. MONACO
Registration No. 30,480
DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP
One Logan Square
18th and Cherry Streets
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Tel: (215) 988-3312
Fax: (215) 988-2757
Attorney for Applicants

[redacted]

EXHIBIT A – "marked-up" version of claim 61

61. (Once Amended) A method for delivering one or more therapeutic agents to the female urinary tract, said method comprising the steps of:

a. inserting the suppository of claims 1 or [32]33 into the urethra of a female patient;

b. waiting a sufficient period for said suppository to deliver one or more therapeutic agents to said urinary tract; and

c. removing the non-meltable reinforcement from the urethra.

[redacted]